

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 034794
ORIGIN EB-08

INFO OCT-01 AF-10 EUR-12 EA-10 ISO-00 SIG-01 TRSE-00
IO-13 HA-05 AID-05 CIAE-00 COME-00 FRB-03 INR-10
NSAE-00 USIA-06 XMB-02 OPIC-03 SP-02 LAB-04
SIL-01 OMB-01 NSC-05 SS-15 STR-07 CEA-01 L-03
H-01 DODE-00 PA-01 PM-05 IGA-02 /137 R

DRAFTED BY EB/IFD/ODF:FVNASH:SMCP
APPROVED BY EB/IFD/ODF:AFWATSON
EUR/RPE - MR. MCLEAN (SUBS)
EUR/RPE - MR. CASEY (INFO)
-----098572 101303Z /46

R 092135Z FEB 78
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY OTTAWA
INFO AMEMBASSY LONDON
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY PARIS
AMEMBASSY STOCKHOLM
AMEMBASSY COPENHAGEN
AMEMBASSY MANILA
AMEMBASSY ABIDJAN
AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 034794

BRUSSELS ALSO USEEC AND STATE/TREASURY TEAM,

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: SHUM, EGEN, PORG, CA

SUBJECT: JOINT STATE/TREASURY HUMAN RIGHTS TEAM'S
DISCUSSIONS WITH CANADIAN OFFICIALS
MANILA FOR USADB, ABIDJAN FOR USAFDF-MATT HENNESEY
REF: 78 STATE 15725
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 034794

SUMMARY: JOINT STATE/TREASURY TEAM MET WITH
CANADIAN COUNTERPARTS ON JANUARY 24 AND EXCHANGED
VIEWS ON APPLICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CRITERIA TO
MULTILATERAL AND BILATERAL AID. MEETING RESULTED
IN BETTER MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF U.S. AND
CANADIAN ATTITUDES TOWARDS SUBJECT AND OPENED
DOOR FOR FURTHER DISCUSSIONS IN THE FUTURE. END SUMMARY.

1. JOINT STATE/TREASURY TEAM MET WITH CANADIAN
COUNTERPARTS ON JANUARY 24 AND EXCHANGED VIEWS ON

APPLICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CRITERIA TO MULTILATERAL
AND BILATERAL AID. PARTICIPANTS WERE:

U.S.:

MR. ROBERT HORMATS, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY, EB
MR. MARK SCHNEIDER, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HUMAN
RIGHTS AND HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS

MR. ARNOLD NACHMANOFF, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR
DEVELOPING NATIONS, TREASURY
MR. STEPHEN OXMAN, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE DEPUTY SECRE-
TARY OF STATE
MR. PAUL MCGONAGLE, AMERICAN EMBASSY, OTTAWA

CANADA:

MR. KLAUS GOLDSCHLAG, ASSISTANT UNDER SECRETARY, EXTAFF
MR. ROBERT JOHNSTONE, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY, EXTAFF
MR. WILLIAM HOOD, ASSOCIATE DEPUTY MINISTER, DEPARTMENT OF
FINANCE
MR. J. H. TAYLOR, ASSISTANT UNDER SECRETARY, EXTAFF
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 034794

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS, VICE PRESIDENT FOR POLICY, CIDA
MR. RONALD ROBERTSON, DIRECTOR UN INSTITUTIONAL AND SOCIAL
AFFAIRS DIVISION, EXTAFF
MS. JOAN KAHN, MULTILATERAL PROGRAMS BRANCH, CIDA
MR. CARL PEDERSON, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEVELOPMENT AND EXPORT
FINANCING POLICY DIVISION, EXTAFF

2. THE U.S. TEAM STRESSED THE FOLLOWING POINTS:

-- THE U.S. HAS BEEN IN THE PROCESS OF WORKING OUT
THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY OF IMPLEMENTING ITS POLICY OF
SECURING GREATER RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS. THIS INITIATIVE
DEVELOPED OUT OF A GROWING SENSE IN THE CONGRESS AND AMONG
THE PUBLIC THAT U.S. FOREIGN POLICY HAD BECOME MORE AND
MORE REMOTE FROM WESTERN DEMOCRATIC VALUES. WE BELIEVE
WE HAVE ESTABLISHED A LOGICAL APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM
WHICH PLACES HEAVY WEIGHT ON HUMAN RIGHTS AS AN ELEMENT IN
U.S. POLICY BUT ALSO ENABLES US TO BALANCE THIS OBJECTIVE
WITH OTHER ELEMENTS OF U.S. POLICY.

-- WE ATTEMPT TO IMPLEMENT HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY IN A
CALIBRATED AND SEQUENTIAL MANNER. FOR INSTANCE, WHEN WE
IDENTIFY A COUNTRY WHICH HAS HUMAN RIGHTS PROBLEMS, WE
DO NOT START BY PROPOSING ECONOMIC SANCTIONS. WE PREFER
TO START WITH DIPLOMATIC APPROACHES. WE EXPRESS
OUR CONCERNS TO A GOVERNMENT BEFORE WE ABSTAIN
OR VOTE "NO" ON AN IFI LOAN TO IT.

-- WE ALSO TRY TO BE POSITIVE RATHER THAN NEGATIVE
IN OUR APPROACH BY GIVING PRIORITY IN OUR AID
PROGRAMS TO THOSE COUNTRIES WHICH HAVE GOOD HUMAN RIGHTS
RECORDS.

-- THE BASIC U.S. OBJECTIVE IS TO INDUCE IMPROVEMENTS
IN HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES BY DEMONSTRATING THAT THERE ARE
COSTS TO GROSS VIOLATORS AND BENEFITS TO THOSE WHO RESPECT
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 034794

HUMAN RIGHTS. WHERE SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS EXIST, HOWEVER,
EVEN WHEN OUR ACTIONS MAY NOT BE EFFECTIVE, WE MAY OPPOSE
LOANS OR DENY ASSISTANCE IN ORDER TO DISSOCIATE THE U.S.
FROM HIGHLY REPRESSIVE GOVERNMENTS.

-- WE PREFER TO USE BILATERAL INSTRUMENTS TO ACHIEVE
OUR HUMAN RIGHTS GOALS, SO AS NOT TO PUT TOO MUCH STRESS
ON INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS. HOWEVER, OUR AID PROGRAM
IS A DIFFICULT TOOL TO USE, AS IT IS DIRECTED PRIMARILY AT
ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RIGHTS. THEREFORE, IT WOULD TAKE A
VERY SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS PROBLEM BEFORE WE WOULD CUT OFF
AID AIMED AT HELPING THE NEEDIEST PEOPLE IN ANY GIVEN
COUNTRY.

-- OUR APPROACH IN THE IFIS IS SHAPED BY TWO FACTORS:
FIRST, THE POLICY OF THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION AND,
SECOND, THE STATUTORY STRUCTURE ENACTED BY CONGRESS. THE
CONGRESS REQUIRES US BY LAW TO OPPOSE ANY LOANS IN ANY OF
THE IFIS TO COUNTRIES WHICH ARE ENGAGED IN A CONSISTENT
PATTERN OF GROSS VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED
HUMAN RIGHTS UNLESS THE LOANS ARE AIMED PRIMARILY AT
MEETING BASIC HUMAN NEEDS.

-- IN THE IFIS, WE SEEK TO ADVANCE OUR HUMAN RIGHTS
OBJECTIVES IN WAYS WHICH DO NOT CONFLICT WITH THE
DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE IFIS; IN FACT, WE BELIEVE
THEY CAN REINFORCE EACH OTHER. WE BELIEVE THESE OBJECTIVES
CAN BE ACHIEVED IN TWO WAYS:

A. IN THE LONGER RUN, BY WORKING WITH OTHER
IFI MEMBERS TO TRY TO CHANNEL FUTURE IFI LENDING TOWARD
COUNTRIES WHICH RESPECT HUMAN RIGHTS AND BY CHANNELING
WHATEVER LENDING IS PLANNED FOR PROBLEM COUNTRIES TO
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 034794

PROJECTS WHICH MEET BASIC HUMAN NEEDS.

B. IN THE SHORTER TERM, BY INDUCING BANK
MANAGEMENTS AND/OR COUNTRIES WITH SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS
PROBLEMS TO DEFER OR WITHDRAW NON-BASIC HUMAN NEEDS LOANS

TO PROBLEM COUNTRIES UNTIL SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENTS OCCUR IN THEIR HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES. IF LOANS TO PROBLEM COUNTRIES ARE BROUGHT TO IFI BOARDS IN THE ABSENCE OF SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENTS IN HUMAN RIGHTS, WE WOULD BE OBLIGED TO CONSIDER SERIOUSLY OPPOSING SUCH LOANS.

-- WITH RESPECT TO THE LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS, WE HAVE TAKEN THE POSITION THAT HUMAN RIGHTS CONSIDERATIONS ARE

VALID IN DETERMINING IFI LENDING AND THAT WE ARE SATISFIED THAT THIS IS A LEGITIMATE POSITION FROM A LEGAL STANDPOINT.

-- WE BELIEVE IT IS IMPORTANT TO "MULTILATERALIZE" CONCERN WITHIN THE IFIS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS PROBLEMS. THE U.S. RECOGNIZES THAT ITS APPROACHES CAN ONLY BE SUCCESSFUL IF IT COORDINATES THEM WITH OTHER, LIKE-MINDED COUNTRIES.

-- IT IS THE CONGRESS WHICH APPROPRIATES FUNDS FOR U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE IFIS. IF A NUMBER OF IFI LOANS ARE APPROVED OVER U.S. OBJECTION OR ABSTENTION, THE CONGRESS MAY QUESTION THE DESIRABILITY OF CONTINUING U.S. SUPPORT FOR THE IFIS. THEREFORE, WE ARE TRYING TO INFLUENCE THE BANKS TO EMPHASIZE PROJECTS WHICH MEET BASIC HUMAN NEEDS IN COUNTRIES WHERE HUMAN RIGHTS ARE VIOLATED SO THAT WE WILL NOT BE PUT IN THE POSITION OF OPPOSING LOANS.

-- IN ASSESSING HUMAN RIGHTS CONDITIONS, WE LOOK TO THREE GROUPS OF RIGHTS: RIGHTS OF THE PERSON, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RIGHTS, AND CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS. WE ARE CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 034794

ESPECIALLY SENSITIVE TO TRENDS. WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS PROBLEMS WHICH MAY REMAIN IN A COUNTRY SHOULD DISENTITLE THAT COUNTRY TO OUR SUPPORT FOR ASSISTANCE TO IT SO LONG AS THERE IS A POSITIVE HUMAN RIGHTS TREND.

-- WHILE THERE IS A GOOD DEAL OF SUBJECTIVITY IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF OUR HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY, WE THINK THE SUBJECTIVITY ISSUE CAN BE OVERDRAWN. HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS OFTEN ARE VERY CLEAR.

-- WE CLEARLY DO NOT WANT TO POLARIZE THE DEBATE OVER THIS ISSUE INTO ONE BETWEEN DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. WE WANT TO DISCUSS WITH OTHER DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES WAYS TO ESTABLISH A VIABLE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD FOR PROTECTING HUMAN RIGHTS AND A CONSENSUS THAT THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS HAVE A ROLE TO PLAY IN THIS AREA.

-- WE WOULD VERY MUCH LIKE TO HAVE CANADA'S VIEWS ON HOW OUR TWO COUNTRIES AND OTHER DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING NATIONS CAN COOPERATE IN ACHIEVING THESE TYPES OF OBJECTIVES. WE ARE NOT INSISTING ON AN AMERICAN APPROACH BUT TRYING TO SHAPE AN INTERNATIONAL APPROACH WHICH ACHIEVES BROADLY SHARED HUMAN RIGHTS STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES. WE DO NOT SEEK IMMEDIATE COMMENTS, SINCE WE RECOGNIZE THE CANADIANS DESIRE TO CONSIDER THESE ISSUES CAREFULLY. BUT

WE WOULD APPRECIATE AT SOME POINT CANADIAN VIEWS ON HOW THE U.S. AND CANADA CAN COORDINATE ACTIONS INVOLVING THE IFIS SO AS TO ACHIEVE MUTUAL OBJECTIVES.

3. THE CANADIAN SIDE MADE THE FOLLOWING POINTS:
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07 STATE 034794

-- THEY AGREED IN PRINCIPLE THAT THE HUMAN RIGHTS OBJECTIVE WAS WORTH PURSUING BUT WERE SOMEWHAT SKEPTICAL AS TO HOW, IN THEIR CASE, THIS COULD BE TRANSLATED INTO OPERATIONAL POLICY DECISIONS AT THE PRESENT TIME.

-- THEY NOTED THAT IT WOULD BE HARD FOR THE GOC TO MOVE TO SANCTIONS IN THE IFIS WHEN THEY HAD NOT EXPLICITLY DRAWN THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONNECTION IN THEIR BILATERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

-- THEY ALSO NOTED THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE CASE OF NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION, THERE EXISTED INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON STANDARDS AND IT WAS THEREFORE BOTH FEASIBLE AND LOGICAL TO CONSIDER SANCTIONS. THE IMPLICATION WAS THAT THE FOUNDATIONS PREREQUISITE TO SANCTIONS HAD NOT YET BEEN LAID IN THE HUMAN RIGHTS AREA.

-- THE CANADIANS ALSO HAD SEVERAL MORE NARROWLY FOCUSED COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS CONCERNING: (A) CRITERIA FOR JUDGING VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE DEGREE TO WHICH HUMAN RIGHTS PERFORMANCE HAD IMPROVED; (B) THE POSITION OF COUNTRIES SUCH AS CANADA WHICH WERE PART OF VOTING CAUCUSES IN THE IFIS; AND (C) THE WEIGHT WHICH SHOULD BE ASSIGNED TO HUMAN RIGHTS VERSUS OTHER POLITICAL/ECONOMIC FACTORS INFLUENCING LOAN DECISIONS. (IN THIS CONNECTION, THE CANADIANS NOTED IN PARTICULAR THEIR COMMONWEALTH AND FRANCOPHONE CONNECTIONS.) IN ADDITION, THEY TOOK NOTE THAT SINCE THE U.S. DOES CONSIDER FACTORS OTHER THAN HUMAN RIGHTS, A SITUATION COULD CONCEIVABLY ARISE WHERE THE U.S. WOULD FAVOR IFI LOANS TO SOME HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATORS AND NOT TO OTHERS.

4. IN RESPONSE TO THE LATTER POINT, THE U.S. SIDE STATED THAT BECAUSE U.S. INTERESTS WITH RESPECT TO PARTICULAR COUNTRIES DIFFER IT PROCEEDS ON A "CASE-BY-CASE" BASIS.
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 08 STATE 034794

THESE DIFFERENCES FROM COUNTRY TO COUNTRY DO NOT DIMINISH
OUR CONCERN FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN ANY COUNTRY; RATHER, THEY
REQUIRE US TO ALTER THE METHODS BY WHICH WE PURSUE OUR
HUMAN RIGHTS OBJECTIVES.

5. THIS TELEGRAM HAS NOT BEEN CLEARED BY THE TEAM. VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 034794
ORIGIN AF-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /011 R

66011
DRAFTED B:AF/W:BRAIN S KIRPATRICK
APPROVED BY:AF/W:TWMSMITH
-----067366 171756Z /43
R 170225Z FEB 78
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
INFO AMEMBASSY CONAKRY 0000

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 034794

FOL STATE 034794 SENT ACTION OTTAWA INFO LONDON BONN PARIS
STOCKHOLM COPENHAGEN MANILA ABIDJAN BRUSSELS FEB 9, 1978
REPEATED TO YOU QUOTE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 034794

BRUSSELS ALSO USEEC AND STATE/TREASURY TEAM,

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: SHUM, EGEN, PORG, CA

SUBJECT: JOINT STATE/TREASURY HUMAN RIGHTS TEAM'S
DISCUSSIONS WITH CANADIAN OFFICIALS
MANILA FOR USADB, ABIDJAN FOR USAFDF-MATT HENNESEY
REF: 78 STATE 15725

SUMMARY: JOINT STATE/TREASURY TEAM MET WITH
CANADIAN COUNTERPARTS ON JANUARY 24 AND EXCHANGED
VIEWS ON APPLICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CRITERIA TO
MULTILATERAL AND BILATERAL AID. MEETING RESULTED
IN BETTER MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF U.S. AND
CANADIAN ATTITUDES TOWARDS SUBJECT AND OPENED
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 034794

DOOR FOR FURTHER DISCUSSIONS IN THE FUTURE. END SUMMARY.

1. JOINT STATE/TREASURY TEAM MET WITH CANADIAN COUNTERPARTS ON JANUARY 24 AND EXCHANGED VIEWS ON APPLICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CRITERIA TO MULTILATERAL AND BILATERAL AID. PARTICIPANTS WERE:

U.S.:

MR. ROBERT HORMATS, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY, EB
MR. MARK SCHNEIDER, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND HUMANITARIAN AFFAIRS

MR. ARNOLD NACHMANOFF, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR DEVELOPING NATIONS, TREASURY
MR. STEPHEN OXMAN, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE
MR. PAUL MCGONAGLE, AMERICAN EMBASSY, OTTAWA

CANADA:

MR. KLAUS GOLDSCHLAG, ASSISTANT UNDER SECRETARY, EXTAFF
MR. ROBERT JOHNSTONE, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY, EXTAFF
MR. WILLIAM HOOD, ASSOCIATE DEPUTY MINISTER, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
MR. J. H. TAYLOR, ASSISTANT UNDER SECRETARY, EXTAFF
MR. WILLIAM JENKINS, VICE PRESIDENT FOR POLICY, CIDA
MR. RONALD ROBERTSON, DIRECTOR UN INSTITUTIONAL AND SOCIAL AFFAIRS DIVISION, EXTAFF
MS. JOAN KAHN, MULTILATERAL PROGRAMS BRANCH, CIDA
MR. CARL PEDERSON, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEVELOPMENT AND EXPORT FINANCING POLICY DIVISION, EXTAFF

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 034794

2. THE U.S. TEAM STRESSED THE FOLLOWING POINTS:

-- THE U.S. HAS BEEN IN THE PROCESS OF WORKING OUT THE MOST EFFECTIVE WAY OF IMPLEMENTING ITS POLICY OF SECURING GREATER RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS. THIS INITIATIVE DEVELOPED OUT OF A GROWING SENSE IN THE CONGRESS AND AMONG THE PUBLIC THAT U.S. FOREIGN POLICY HAD BECOME MORE AND MORE REMOTE FROM WESTERN DEMOCRATIC VALUES. WE BELIEVE WE HAVE ESTABLISHED A LOGICAL APPROACH TO THE PROBLEM WHICH PLACES HEAVY WEIGHT ON HUMAN RIGHTS AS AN ELEMENT IN U.S. POLICY BUT ALSO ENABLES US TO BALANCE THIS OBJECTIVE WITH OTHER ELEMENTS OF U.S. POLICY.

-- WE ATTEMPT TO IMPLEMENT HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY IN A CALIBRATED AND SEQUENTIAL MANNER. FOR INSTANCE, WHEN WE IDENTIFY A COUNTRY WHICH HAS HUMAN RIGHTS PROBLEMS, WE

DO NOT START BY PROPOSING ECONOMIC SANCTIONS. WE PREFER TO START WITH DIPLOMATIC APPROACHES. WE EXPRESS OUR CONCERNS TO A GOVERNMENT BEFORE WE ABSTAIN OR VOTE "NO" ON AN IFI LOAN TO IT.

-- WE ALSO TRY TO BE POSITIVE RATHER THAN NEGATIVE IN OUR APPROACH BY GIVING PRIORITY IN OUR AID PROGRAMS TO THOSE COUNTRIES WHICH HAVE GOOD HUMAN RIGHTS RECORDS.

-- THE BASIC U.S. OBJECTIVE IS TO INDUCE IMPROVEMENTS IN HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES BY DEMONSTRATING THAT THERE ARE COSTS TO GROSS VIOLATORS AND BENEFITS TO THOSE WHO RESPECT HUMAN RIGHTS. WHERE SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS EXIST, HOWEVER, EVEN WHEN OUR ACTIONS MAY NOT BE EFFECTIVE, WE MAY OPPOSE LOANS OR DENY ASSISTANCE IN ORDER TO DISSOCIATE THE U.S. FROM HIGHLY REPRESSIVE GOVERNMENTS.

-- WE PREFER TO USE BILATERAL INSTRUMENTS TO ACHIEVE OUR HUMAN RIGHTS GOALS, SO AS NOT TO PUT TOO MUCH STRESS
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 034794

ON INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS. HOWEVER, OUR AID PROGRAM IS A DIFFICULT TOOL TO USE, AS IT IS DIRECTED PRIMARILY AT ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL RIGHTS. THEREFORE, IT WOULD TAKE A VERY SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS PROBLEM BEFORE WE WOULD CUT OFF AID AIMED AT HELPING THE NEEDIEST PEOPLE IN ANY GIVEN COUNTRY.

-- OUR APPROACH IN THE IFIS IS SHAPED BY TWO FACTORS: FIRST, THE POLICY OF THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION AND, SECOND, THE STATUTORY STRUCTURE ENACTED BY CONGRESS. THE CONGRESS REQUIRES US BY LAW TO OPPOSE ANY LOANS IN ANY OF THE IFIS TO COUNTRIES WHICH ARE ENGAGED IN A CONSISTENT PATTERN OF GROSS VIOLATION OF INTERNATIONALLY RECOGNIZED HUMAN RIGHTS UNLESS THE LOANS ARE AIMED PRIMARILY AT MEETING BASIC HUMAN NEEDS.

-- IN THE IFIS, WE SEEK TO ADVANCE OUR HUMAN RIGHTS OBJECTIVES IN WAYS WHICH DO NOT CONFLICT WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES OF THE IFIS; IN FACT, WE BELIEVE THEY CAN REINFORCE EACH OTHER. WE BELIEVE THESE OBJECTIVES CAN BE ACHIEVED IN TWO WAYS:

A. IN THE LONGER RUN, BY WORKING WITH OTHER IFI MEMBERS TO TRY TO CHANNEL FUTURE IFI LENDING TOWARD COUNTRIES WHICH RESPECT HUMAN RIGHTS AND BY CHANNELING WHATEVER LENDING IS PLANNED FOR PROBLEM COUNTRIES TO PROJECTS WHICH MEET BASIC HUMAN NEEDS.

B. IN THE SHORTER TERM, BY INDUCING BANK MANAGERMENTS AND/OR COUNTRIES WITH SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS

PROBLEMS TO DEFER OR WITHDRAW NON-BASIC HUMAN NEEDS LOANS
TO PROBLEM COUNTRIES UNTIL SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENTS OCCUR
IN THEIR HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES. IF LOANS TO PROBLEM
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 034794

COUNTRIES ARE BROUGHT TO IFI BOARDS IN THE ABSENCE OF
SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENTS IN HUMAN RIGHTS, WE WOULD BE
OBLIGED TO CONSIDER SERIOUSLY OPPOSING SUCH LOANS.

-- WITH RESPECT TO THE LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS, WE HAVE
TAKEN THE POSITION THAT HUMAN RIGHTS CONSIDERATIONS ARE

VALID IN DETERMINING IFI LENDING AND THAT WE ARE SATISFIED
THAT THIS IS A LEGITIMATE POSITION FROM A LEGAL STANDPOINT.

-- WE BELIEVE IT IS IMPORTANT TO "MULTILATERALIZE"
CONCERN WITHIN THE IFIS FOR HUMAN RIGHTS PROBLEMS. THE
U.S. RECOGNIZES THAT ITS APPROACHES CAN ONLY BE SUCCESSFUL
IF IT COORDINATES THEM WITH OTHER, LIKE-MINDED
COUNTRIES.

-- IT IS THE CONGRESS WHICH APPROPRIATES FUNDS FOR
U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE IFIS. IF A NUMBER OF IFI LOANS
ARE APPROVED OVER U.S. OBJECTION OR ABSTENTION, THE
CONGRESS MAY QUESTION THE DESIRABILITY OF CONTINUING U.S.
SUPPORT FOR THE IFIS. THEREFORE, WE ARE TRYING TO
INFLUENCE THE BANKS TO EMPHASIZE PROJECTS WHICH MEET BASIC
HUMAN NEEDS IN COUNTRIES WHERE HUMAN RIGHTS ARE VIOLATED
SO THAT WE WILL NOT BE PUT IN THE POSITION OF OPPOSING
LOANS.

-- IN ASSESSING HUMAN RIGHTS CONDITIONS, WE LOOK TO
THREE GROUPS OF RIGHTS: RIGHTS OF THE PERSON, ECONOMIC
AND SOCIAL RIGHTS, AND CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS. WE ARE
ESPECIALLY SENSITIVE TO TRENDS. WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT
SERIOUS HUMAN RIGHTS PROBLEMS WHICH MAY REMAIN IN A
COUNTRY SHOULD DISENTITLE THAT COUNTRY TO OUR SUPPORT FOR
ASSISTANCE TO IT SO LONG AS THERE IS A POSITIVE HUMAN
RIGHTS TREND.

-- WHILE THERE IS A GOOD DEAL OF SUBJECTIVITY IN THE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 06 STATE 034794

IMPLEMENTATION OF OUR HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY, WE THINK THE
SUBJECTIVITY ISSUE CAN BE OVERDRAWN. HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLA-
TIONS OFTEN ARE VERY CLEAR.

-- WE CLEARLY DO NOT WANT TO POLARIZE THE DEBATE
OVER THIS ISSUE INTO ONE BETWEEN DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING
COUNTRIES. WE WANT TO DISCUSS WITH OTHER DEVELOPED AND

DEVELOPING COUNTRIES WAYS TO ESTABLISH A VIABLE INTERNATIONAL STANDARD FOR PROTECTING HUMAN RIGHTS AND A CONSENSUS THAT THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS HAVE A ROLE TO PLAY IN THIS AREA.

-- WE WOULD VERY MUCH LIKE TO HAVE CANADA'S VIEWS ON HOW OUR TWO COUNTRIES AND OTHER DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING NATIONS CAN COOPERATE IN ACHIEVING THESE TYPES OF OBJECTIVES. WE ARE NOT INSISTING ON AN AMERICAN APPROACH BUT TRYING TO SHAPE AN INTERNATIONAL APPROACH WHICH ACHIEVES BROADLY SHARED HUMAN RIGHTS STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES. WE DO NOT SEEK IMMEDIATE COMMENTS, SINCE WE RECOGNIZE THE CANADIANS DESIRE TO CONSIDER THESE ISSUES CAREFULLY. BUT

WE WOULD APPRECIATE AT SOME POINT CANADIAN VIEWS ON HOW THE U.S. AND CANADA CAN COORDINATE ACTIONS INVOLVING THE IFIS SO AS TO ACHIEVE MUTUAL OBJECTIVES.

3. THE CANADIAN SIDE MADE THE FOLLOWING POINTS:

-- THEY AGREED IN PRINCIPLE THAT THE HUMAN RIGHTS OBJECTIVE WAS WORTH PURSUING BUT WERE SOMEWHAT SKEPTICAL AS TO HOW, IN THEIR CASE, THIS COULD BE TRANSLATED INTO OPERATIONAL POLICY DECISIONS AT THE PRESENT TIME.

-- THEY NOTED THAT IT WOULD BE HARD FOR THE GOC TO
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 07 STATE 034794

MOVE TO SANCTIONS IN THE IFIS WHEN THEY HAD NOT EXPLICITLY DRAWN THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONNECTION IN THEIR BILATERAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.

-- THEY ALSO NOTED THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, IN THE CASE OF NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION, THERE EXISTED INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON STANDARDS AND IT WAS THEREFORE BOTH FEASIBLE AND LOGICAL TO CONSIDER SANCTIONS. THE IMPLICATION WAS THAT THE FOUNDATIONS PREREQUISITE TO SANCTIONS HAD NOT YET BEEN LAID IN THE HUMAN RIGHTS AREA.

-- THE CANADIANS ALSO HAD SEVERAL MORE NARROWLY FOCUSED COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS CONCERNING: (A) CRITERIA FOR JUDGING VIOLATIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE DEGREE TO WHICH HUMAN RIGHTS PERFORMANCE HAD IMPROVED; (B) THE POSITION OF COUNTRIES SUCH AS CANADA WHICH WERE PART OF VOTING CAUCUSES IN THE IFIS; AND (C) THE WEIGHT WHICH SHOULD BE ASSIGNED TO HUMAN RIGHTS VERSUS OTHER POLITICAL/ECONOMIC FACTORS INFLUENCING LOAN DECISIONS. (IN THIS CONNECTION, THE CANADIANS NOTED IN PARTICULAR THEIR COMMONWEALTH AND FRANCOPHONE CONNECTIONS.) IN ADDITION, THEY TOOK NOTE THAT SINCE THE U.S. DOES CONSIDER FACTORS OTHER THAN HUMAN RIGHTS, A SITUATION COULD CONCEIVABLY ARISE WHERE THE U.S. WOULD FAVOR IFI LOANS TO SOME HUMAN

RIGHTS VIOLATORS AND NOT TO OTHERS.

4. IN RESPONSE TO THE LATTER POINT, THE U.S. SIDE STATED THAT BECAUSE U.S. INTERESTS WITH RESPECT TO PARTICULAR COUNTRIES DIFFER IT PROCEEDS ON A "CASE-BY-CASE" BASIS. THESE DIFFERENCES FROM COUNTRY TO COUNTRY DO NOT DIMINISH OUR CONCERN FOR HUMAN RIGHTS IN ANY COUNTRY; RATHER, THEY REQUIRE US TO ALTER THE METHODS BY WHICH WE PURSUE OUR HUMAN RIGHTS OBJECTIVES.

5. THIS TELEGRAM HAS NOT BEEN CLEARED BY THE TEAM. VANCE
UNQUOTE VANCE
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 08 STATE 034794

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 26 sep 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: HUMAN RIGHTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 09 feb 1978
Decaption Date: 01 jan 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 20 Mar 2014
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1978STATE034794
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: EB/IFD/ODF:FVNASH:SMCP
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Expiration:
Film Number: D780062-0720
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1978/newtext/t197802120/baaafbuj.tel
Line Count: 559
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 439cb5cf-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN EB
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 11
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 78 STATE 15725
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 25 may 2005
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 3475236
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: JOINT STATE/TREASURY HUMAN RIGHTS TEAM'S DISCUSSIONS WITH CANADIAN OFFICIALS MANILA FOR USADB, ABIDJAN
FOR USAFDF-MATT HENNESEY
TAGS: SHUM, EGEN, PORC, CA
To: OTTAWA INFO LONDON MULTIPLE
Type: TE
vdkgvkey: odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/439cb5cf-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Sheryl P. Walter
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
20 Mar 2014
Markings: Sheryl P. Walter Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 20 Mar 2014